

NOTES ON THE JOT PROGRAM/PROBLEM

25X1A9a

Facts: The JOT program, under Mr. [REDACTED] currently emphasizes (a) age, preferably 25-26 or so; (b) graduate degree, the feeling being that its nice to get that extra knowledge/maturity. Obviously and of course, an outstanding younger B.A. is taken.

Military personnel are not taken through the JOT program now unless absolutely outstanding. The channel is being kept open in case it ever becomes desirable to reactivate it; hence, some military JOT's will continue to come in.

Internals have proven to be very stable in returning to Agency jobs; few of them resign.

Questions: Is the current "large number" JOT policy, able to benefit much from "ancient history"; the 1951-60 classes? Probably some, but not overwhelmingly. Thus, it seems that not too much staff time should be wasted on the project in B-C which follows. *

Is the claim that younger personnel in the JOT program quit with more frequency than older ones borne out? See D for a start on the answer to this.

If the JOT (CTP) program is so doggone important, why aren't the records as to their progress updated annually? This task should be assigned to someone, so that the data is always available. It can be easily updated by machine-run (see NOTE, B); the same program can be used each year. The final format of information should be as in the "JOT Master Listing, Updated, As of 31 December 1963". Information not requiring updating would be entered by the JOT office as each class EOD'd. Reasons for separation from Agency employ should also be kept track of: telephone calls to components could reveal these at the annual check-ups.

Providing additional JOT's without overburdening staffs

- (1) Cut down on the excessive length of JOT course! This is probably the most ridiculous facet of the Agency; the assinitly of that course, which has persisted for at least 4 years, unchanged, in spite of repeated and often violent student protests;
- (2) Cut down on A&E and Phsyh tests for most JOT's, and put the \$\$\$ from salaries, space, and time saved into more OTR people;
- (3) Don't use JOT's for jobs which clericals can do, which probably includes a lot of OCI stuff(which could be handled by girls from out of B.A. degrees for short times), many DDS jobs, probably also DDP ones.

*the '51-55 study cites 8-13 years as almost too short a time (see Conclusions in that study). How does this make the '56-60 study, in which 5-9 years would be involved, seem?

DOC	6	REV DATE	2-7-81	BY	006199
ORIG CLASS	22	PAGES	28	TYPE	01
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2011	REV CLASS	C
				AUTH	HR 14-3

PREPARING A JOT '56 to '60 "ALUMNI" STUDY

It would probably be helpful to compile a "twin" to the 51-55 alumni study, so the two could be easily compared. The following data is necessary:

1. List of JOT classes, 1956-60 (^{see "C"} ~~attached~~);
2. Whether they are in or out of Agency, plus (a) GS grade; (b) DOB; (c) Designation; These facts are available, but only as of Dec. 1963.

It will be necessary to extract the above information from the JOTC Roster of JOB #744, Personal Status Report (machine run). This is done as follows (see 1956 class list for example):

- (1) Starting at Class #11 (#10 is already done), compare the machine-run list with the attached class list. Write down any changes in (a) Division, (b) Grade. Then add (a) Age, and (b) Service, which for these classes will inevitably be "D".
- (2) When a name on the Class list does not appear in the machine run, put a "?" beside it. When the whole list has been done, list these "?"-names by alphabet and by grade, and then go back through JOB #744 -- first the separations, then the retentions -- to find where the person has gone: out, or to another component.

All of this is clerical-type work. The tables in the '51-'55 "Alumni" Study can be derived, for '56-'60, from the results of the foregoing.

NOTE: the names on List X can be given to the computer people -- [REDACTED] shop -- and any intelligent programmer can get all of the above very simply. Just give them the name; they should feed the computer the names and ask it for Division, Grade, Yr. of Birth, Sex, and current Component Designation.

They can also, simultaneously, ask the computer for on-duty totals, by year, and for summaries as indicated in the tables on pp 2, 3, 4,

The "Conclusions" section might compare results from the 1st study and the second, and then comment on the 2nd study itself and the JOT program as a whole.

It should be noted that through 1960, the JOT input was not great. The whole question of "so what, from today's point of view?", can certainly be raised for any Alumni study of another "era".

Lists of JOT Classes, by Class, 1955 through 1960.

Only 1956-1960 are needed for the updated ("second Five") study. The first class in 1956 was also called, and is still so called in some machine runs, class #10.

The 1956 class has the first class updated just to show how it can easily be done. Cross out the Division designation once a man has been located.

Finding figures:

- (1) Total Hired -- Resignations indicated on sheets plus ~~new absences from machine-run listings (assume resigned)~~ names listed on sheets.
- (2) Total Resigned -- Resignations indicated on sheets plus new absences from machine-run listings (assume resigned).
- (3) Left: On Duty
- (4) Females: can be seen from name, usually, also from machine-runs, where sex is indicated.
- (5) Military: some of the JOT data enclosed gives this, others does not. The lists will have to be sent to the JOT office and they must mark those who were military.